

EA



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,184	12/01/2003	Brian K. Revill	050885-0306961	1330
43569	7590	08/17/2005	EXAMINER	
MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP 1909 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006			PATEL, VISHAL A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3679	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/724,184

Applicant(s)

REVILL ET AL.

Examiner

Vishal Patel

Art Unit

3679

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,7-10,12 and 14-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,7-10,12 and 14-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: The dependency of the claim is incorrect. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 18 recites the limitation "the frame" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. Claim 17 recites the limitation "the plane" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant claims the frame to be substantially square or rectangular, this is not true because the frame has an inner periphery that is curved convex configuration hence the frame cannot be substantially square or rectangular.

Furthermore applicant claims (in claim 22) the frame is of rectangular cross-section, this is also not true. How can the frame have a rectangular cross-section when the inner peripheral edge is continuously curved convex configuration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 12, 15-16, 18-19, 21-22 and 29-32 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jelinek (US. 4,026,565).

Regarding claim 1: Jelinek discloses a gasket (gasket of figure 2 or 6) comprising a substantially unitary frame (frame formed by 63) having an inner peripheral edge (inner edge of 63 that has 20) and an outer peripheral edge (outer edge of 63). The inner peripheral edge being convex (convex structure of the inner edge of 63) and of continuously curved configuration over the full width of the gasket (the curved convex configuration of 63 is over the full width of the gasket) and being provided with a liner (20) of chemically resistant material conforming with the convex and continuously curved inner peripheral edge (line 20 is conforming with the convex and continuously curved inner peripheral edge). The liner is conforming to the convex inner peripheral edge and a portion of the frame in addition to the inner peripheral edge (the inner peripheral is the far inner edge of 62 and the additional coverage is a portion of 64). The liner is substantially U-shape (the inner surface of liner is U-shape).

Regarding claim 3: The inner peripheral edge is part-circular in cross-section (63 having a part-circular cross-section).

Art Unit: 3679

Regarding claim 4: The gasket has holes to accommodate sealing bolts (as showed in figure 1, gasket in figure 6 would have mounting holes in the gasket).

Regarding claim 7: The opposite faces of the gasket are planar (planar portion of 20).

Regarding claims 8-9: A gasket (gasket of figure 6) comprising a frame (frame formed by 63) having an inner peripheral edge and an outer peripheral edge and including a protrusion or nose at the inner peripheral edge (protrusion or nose at the inner edge of 63). The protrusion or nose being convex and of continuously curved configuration over the full width of the gasket and being provided with a liner (20) of chemically resistant material conforming with the convex and continuously curved inner peripheral edge (the liner 20 is conforming with the inner peripheral edge of the frame). The protrusion or nose extends around substantially the entire perimetral length of the frame (the protrusion or nose at the inner peripheral edge extends the entire perimeter of the frame).

Regarding claim 10: The protrusion or nose is provided on the inner peripheral edge of the frame (the protrusion being convex and continuously curved configuration is at the inner peripheral edge of the frame).

Regarding claim 12: The protrusion or nose is of curved bulbous configuration (the protrusion or nose is of bulbous configuration).

Regarding claim 15: The protrusion or nose is of a shape capable (able to) of *effecting a pinch seal when used with a second gasket (intended use) in the from of a frame having an inner peripheral edge and an outer peripheral edge, the inner peripheral edge of the gasket being of continuously curved convex configuration and being provided with a liner of chemically resistant*

Art Unit: 3679

material conforming with the continuously curved inner peripheral edge (intended use). The protrusion or nose is convex through the width of the frame.

Regarding claim 16: The gasket is provided with a protrusion or nose on opposite sides thereof (the outer peripheral edge of 63 is also has a protrusion or nose).

Regarding claim 18: The frame is suitable (frame 63 is capable of being compressed) *for compression with the frame of the second gasket of similar configuration between pair of flanges (intended use), the protrusion being resilient for effecting a pinch seal with a similar protrusion on a second gasket.*

Regarding claims 19: A gasket (gasket of figure 6) *effective for compression together with a frame of a second gasket of similar configuration between a pair of flanges (intended use)*, the gasket comprising a frame (63 that forms a frame) having a resilient protrusion (protrusion formed by the inner edge of 63) on one side thereof *for effecting a pinch seal with a similar protrusion on the second gasket (intended use)*, the resilient protrusion being located at or adjacent the inner periphery of the frame (the protrusions is located at the inner periphery of the frame of the gasket) and remote from the outer periphery of the frame. The protrusion being convex and continuously curved configuration over the full width of the gasket and being provided with a liner of chemically resistant material conforming with the convex and continuously curved inner peripheral edge.

Regarding claims 21: A gasket (gasket of figure 6) comprising a square or rectangular frame (rectangular frame as showed in figure 1).

As to claim 22, see figure 5.

Art Unit: 3679

8. Claims 1, 3, 7-10, 15, 18-19, 21, 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Custer (US. 2,511,330).

Custer illustrates in figure 13, a gasket comprising a substantially unitary frame having an inner peripheral edge and an outer peripheral edge (inner edge 21a and opposite edge being the outer peripheral edge), the inner edge being convex and of continuously curved configuration over the full width of the gasket and being provided with a liner (liner formed of 14 in figure 13) of chemically resistant material conforming with the convex and continuously curved inner peripheral edge and a portion of the frame in addition to the inner peripheral edge (the liner on surfaces 21a and frame surfaces 20a). As to claim 3, the inner peripheral edge is part-circular in cross section (see figure 13). As to claim 7, the opposite faces of the gasket are planar (the surface above 20a are planar). The inner edge is curved bulbous configuration. The convex portion is capable of effecting a pinch seal (the gasket of Custer illustrates all the structural limitations as claimed) *when used with a second gasket (intended use)*. The frame is **substantially** square or rectangular with the inner peripheral edge to be convex. The liner is **substantially** uniform thickness.

With regards to claim 15, “when used with a second gasket...edge.” is considered to be intended use limitation.

With regards to claim 18, “for compression with the frame...flanges”, this limitations is considered to be intended used limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3679

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 12, 14, 15, 18-20 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer (US. 6,481,722) in view of Breaker (US. 5,518,257).

Shaffer illustrates a gasket comprising a substantially unitary frame having an inner peripheral edge and an outer peripheral edge, the inner peripheral edge being convex and of continuously curved configuration over the full width of the gasket and the frame having two planar sides. The frame is provided with holes to accommodate sealing bolts (holes that receive bolts). The inner peripheral edge is part-circular in cross-section.

Shaffer discloses the invention substantially as claimed above but fails to disclose that a liner is placed on the inner peripheral edge and a portion of the frame in addition the inner peripheral edge. Breaker teaches to have a liner (526) having substantially uniform thickness is placed on an inner peripheral edge of a frame and over an additional portion of the frame (liner 526 of figure 13 that is placed over the frame). The frame is made of metal or plastic or other materials. The liner is conformed to the frame of the gasket. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the inner peripheral edge and a portion of the frame of Shaffer to be covered by a liner as taught by Breaker, to provide a seal device that is corrosion resistant (column 2, lines 65-66 and column 9, lines 15-17 of Breaker).

With regards to claim 15, "when used with a second gasket...edge." is considered to be intended use limitation.

Art Unit: 3679

With regards to claim 18, “for compression with the frame... flanges”, this limitations is considered to be intended used limitation.

11. Claims 26, 28-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer and Breaker as applied to claims above, and further in view of Foster (US. 5,240,766).

Shaffer and Breaker disclose the invention substantially as claimed above but fail to disclose that the frame is made of a plasticized resin. Foster discloses to make a gasket having a frame that is formed of plasticized resin (see abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the frame of Shaffer and Breaker to be made of a plasticized resin as taught by Foster, to provide a frame of a gasket having better sealability and thermal stability (see abstract).

12. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer, Breaker and Foster.

Regarding claim 27: Shaffer, Breaker and Foster discloses the claimed invention except for the resin to be EPDM. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the resin of Shaffer, Breaker and Foster to be EPDM resin, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a know material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

13. Claims 8, 17, 21-22 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forry (US. 6,093,467) in view of Breaker.

Forry disclose a gasket having a substantially unitary frame (frame is formed by 18 and member having surfaces 17 and 31), the frame having an inner peripheral edge that is convex

Art Unit: 3679

and of continuously curved configuration (see figure 5) over the full width of the gasket, the frame is locally enlarged (enlarged portion of the frame that passes the plane surface of the frame 54) at its inner peripheral edge to form the nose which projects beyond the plane of the gasket on one side thereof to effect sealing contact, the gasket comprises a square or rectangular substantially unitary frame (the gasket is square or rectangular) and the cross-section of the frame is rectangular cross section (the cross-section of the frame is substantially rectangular). Forry discloses the invention substantially as claimed above but fails to disclose that a liner is placed on the frame that conforms to the convex surface of the frame. Beaker teaches to have a liner (526) having substantially uniform thickness is placed on an inner peripheral edge of a frame and over an additional portion of the frame (liner 526 of figure 13 that is placed over the frame). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the inner peripheral edge and a portion of the frame of Forry to be covered by a liner as taught by Breaker, to provide a seal device that is corrosion resistant (column 2, lines 65-66 and column 9, lines 15-17 of Breaker).

14. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Custer in view of Morris (US. 4,892,632).

Custer discloses the invention substantially as claimed above but fails to disclose that the gasket is provided with a protrusion or nose on opposite sides thereof. Morris teaches to have a gasket frame (as showed in figure 6) that has protrusion or nose on opposite sides thereof (protrusions 14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the gasket of Custer to have protrusion on opposite sides thereof to provide a gasket load (column 5, lines 10-11 of Morris).

Art Unit: 3679

15. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forry and Breaker as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Morris (US. 4,892,632).

Forry and Breaker disclose the invention substantially as claimed above but fail to disclose that the gasket is provided with a protrusion or nose on opposite sides thereof. Morris teaches to have a gasket frame (as showed in figure 6) that has protrusion or nose on opposite sides thereof (protrusions 14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the gasket of Forry and Breaker to have protrusion on opposite sides there of to provide a gasket load (column 5, lines 10-11 of Morris).

16. Claims 2, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jelinek in view of Breaker (US. 5,518,257).

Jelinek discloses the invention substantially as claimed above but fails to disclose that the liner is made of polytetrafluoroethylene. Breaker discloses a gasket having a frame and a liner (226) that is formed of polytetrafluoroethylene. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the liner of Jelinek to be formed of polytetrafluoroethylene as taught by Breaker, to provide anti-corrosion (column 9, lines 15-18 of Breaker).

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 7-10, 12 and 14-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

18. Applicant's arguments filed 6/8/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 3679

Applicants' argument that Jelinek does disclose the liner conforming with the convex portion and a portion of the frame in addition of the inner peripheral edge is not persuasive because as seen in figure 2 that the liner is completely encapsulating the frame.

Applicants' argument toward Plunkett is persuasive and the rejection is withdrawn.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vishal Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-7060. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am to 8:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on 571-272-7087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VP
August 12, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vishal Patel', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Vishal Patel
Patent Examiner
Tech. Center 3600